Philosophy.....

The Philosophy of Dayanand is another name given by his followers to the Philosophy of the Vedas which were considered by the sage to be eternal and true. While Christianity claims that God created this universe out of *nothing*, the physical science pronounces the matter to be indestructible and in perpetual existence. Swami Dayanand Saraswati, the founder of Arya Samaj, who gave a new Vedic thought-current to the Hindus, proclaims that alongwith Him (*Om, Brahm*) the *Atman* (soul) and *Prakriti* (matter energy) too are eternal ; *Brahm* (He) pervades the soul (*Atman*) from within and without and that it is the soul (*Atman*) in the body form that partakes of *Prakriti* in so many multiforms. The Philosophy of Dayanand is simple and terse. Yet it might leave many a reader unconvinced. In the words of Rishi Dayanand "Conviction comes only by His grace." This book is an attempt to place at the disposal of the reader, who might genuinely be interested in the subject, the truth as expounded by Swami Dayanand—the enlightened soul the like of which comes once in a millenium.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE VEDAS

Dr. Satya Prakash

Published by
ARYODAYA WEEKLY
15, Hanuman Road
New Delhi-1 (India)

Editors ;
RAGHUVIR SINGH SHASTRI, M.P.
BHARATENDRA NATH

Price—50 Paise

Printed by
The Raisina Printery
4, Chamelian Road
Delhi-6

THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE VEDAS

DAYĀNANDA writes at one place : "The universal truths, which have been accepted by all, in all times, and which will be acceptable in future too, form the essentials of an eternal *Sanātana* religion, unrefuted by anybody. Those people who are merged into ignorance, or are deluded by prejudiced people, believe in what is contrary, and the learned or wise never follow them. Whatever is accepted by *āptas*, that is, by those who believe in truth, who speak truth, and who act unto truth, who are selfless and without prejudice, is acceptable to all ; and whatever is not acceptable to them is not acceptable and cannot be regarded as standard. Now, whatever is in accordance to the Veda and other true *śāstras*, and whatever has been acceptable to seers ranging from Brahmā down to Jaimini, is acceptable to me also, and that only I am giving out to learned people. I submit only to those principles which in all three times (past, present and future) have been equally acceptable to all. I am not at all anxious to give out any new speculation or to start a new sect, but my ambition is to believe and make others believe in whatever is truth, and to discard and make others discard whatever is untruth."

Dayānanda at any stage has never claimed that he has given out anything which may be called new. He makes a firm stand on the Vedas, and this too is not new. "Right from Brahmā," as he says, "down to Jaimini, all the great seers have accepted the supreme authority of the Vedas." Even the later thinkers like Sāyana, Rāmānuja and Madhvāchārya, never questioned the ultimateness of the Vedas in all

matters of knowledge and truth. Some of the modern interpreters do not appear to give any importance to this fact that the authority of the Vedas has never been denied by the greatest of the Brahmanical thinkers. I would quote at length Sir S. Radhakrishnan to show how he also misrepresents the ancient seers in matters of their adherence to the Veda. He writes as follows :

"They are the Brahmanical systems, since they all accept the authority of the Vedas. The systems of thought which admit of the validity of the Vedas are called the *āstika* and those which repudiate it *nāstika*. The *āstika* or *nāstika* character of a system does not depend on its positive or negative conclusions regarding the nature of the supreme spirit, but on the acceptance and non-acceptance of the authority of the Vedas. Even the schools of Buddhism have their origin in Upanishads ; though they are not regarded as orthobox, since they do not accept the authority of the Vedas.

"The acceptance of the Veda is a practical admission that spiritual experience is a greater light in these matters than intellectual reason. *It does not mean either full agreement with all the doctrines of the Veda or admission of any belief in the existence of God.* It means only a serious attempt to solve the ultimate mystery of existence ; for even the infallibility of the Veda is not admitted by the schools in the same sense. As we shall see, the Vaiśeṣika and the Nyāya accept God as the result of inference. The Sāṁkhya is not a theism. The Yoga is practically independent of the Veda. The two Mīmāṁsās are more directly dependent on the Vedas. The Pūrva-Mīmāṁsā derives the general conception of deity from the Vedas, but is not anxious about the supreme spirit. The Uttara-Mīmāṁsā accepts God on the basis of Śruti assisted by inference, while realisation of God

can be had through meditation and Jñāna. Theistically-minded thinkers of a later day declined to include the Sāmkhya under orthodox *darśanas*.

"The philosophical character of the system is not much compromised by the acceptance of the Veda. The distinction between Śruti and Śmṛti is well known, and where the two conflict, the former is to prevail. The Śruti itself is divided into the karmakāṇḍa (the Saṁhitās and the Brāhmaṇas) and the Jnānakāṇḍa (the Upaniṣads). The latter is of higher value, though much of it is set aside as mere arthavāda or non-essential statements. *All these distinctions enable one to treat the Vedic testimony in a very liberal spirit.* The interpretations of the Vedic texts depend on the *philosophical predilections* of the authors. *While employing logical methods and arriving at truths agreeable to reason, they were yet anxious to preserve their continuity with the ancient texts. They did not wish it to be thought that they were enunciating something completely new. While this may involve a certain want of frankness with themselves, it helped the spread of what they regarded as truth."* (*Indian Philosophy*, Vol. II, 20, 1927)

Nothing can be more misrepresented than what has been done here. It is beyond doubt that all the six systems of Brāhmaṇical philosophy believed in the infallibility of the Vedas. It was not with the anxiety to preserve a link with the ancient texts that they took their stand on the supreme sanction of the Vedas. It was neither that they treated the Vedic testimony in a very liberal spirit, nor was it a fact that they interpreted the Vedic texts according to their predilections. To ascribe a certain amount of want of frankness to them will be insinuous and unphilosophical like. Those philosophers who were pledged to be truthful or who were anxious to seek after truth could not have taken it very lightly to

accept the supremacy of the Vedas withont examining thoroughly. How can it be expected from one who is prepared to argue about even the existence of Brahman and Ātman, who is ever prepared to apply crucial tests to the most of the fundamental problems, who has set up a definite line of approach for all matters of concern, and from one who spares not argument without hair-splitting it to accept the infallibility of the Vedas without pondering over the consequences of it? Was it simply to gain public popularity, or was it simply with the idea that a belief like this will help him in the spread of what he regarded as truth? It is hard to believe all this. The ancient seers may be wrong in their beliefs, they may be erring in their judgments, but they were sincere in their expressions. Is it not a predilection on the part of the modern author to say that the acceptance of the Veda does not mean *full agreement with all the doctrines* of the Veda? How has this inference been drawn? Has he found a single instance in which any of the authors has deilberately and consciously expressed disagreement with the Vedic text? It is another thing that they might have differed amongst themselves regarding a particular interpretation, but so far as the principle of the acceptence of the infallibility of the Vedas is concerned, they have never expressed any disagreement. You will never find anywhere in the Sūtra texts mentioned that the author believes in a particular truth while the Śruti is against it.

We will consider the supreme authority of the Veda in some subsequent chapter. Here we shall say this much that the six Brahmanical systems were one in this respect. The Sāṁkhya has discussed the *Svatah-pramāṇatva* of the Veda in its own way. The Pūrva-mīmāṁsā has discussed the *Nittyatva* of *Śabda* in this connection. The Vaiśeṣika mentions the

pramāṇatva of Āmnāya. The Nyāya has discussed the subject in logical way in details along with *Śabda pramāṇa*. The Vedānta believes in the Veda as revealed knowledge. Even Patañjali when says "स पूर्वेषामपि गुरुः कालेनानवच्छेदात्" (Samādhipāda, 26) he refers to the revelation which took place in the earliest times of the creation.

All the six systems of Indian philosophy are based on the Upaniṣads In fact, they are essentially in agreement with all that these Upaniṣads have given out. Simply the form of presentation is different. There is hardly any Upaniṣad which does not believe in the infallibility of the Veda. Īśa, the most famous of the Upaniṣads, is a part and portion of the Yajuḥ. Bṛhadāraṇyaka forms a long chapter of the voluminous work of Yājñavalkya, the Śatapatha, while the work as a whole is the Brahmanic exposition of the Yajurveda. Nobody can have the slightest doubt in Yājñavalkya's strong belief in the supremacy of the Veda. Chhāndogya Upaniṣad is essentially a Sāmavedic Upaniṣad. Taittiriya identifies *Bhūh*, *Bhuvah* and *Svah* respectively wilh the three Vedas, Ṛk, Sāma and Yajuḥ. In fact, nobody can have the slightest doubt that all Upaniṣads agree in the authority of the Vedas. One can easily work it out that all the Upaniṣadic truths are mere poetic or philosophic expositions of the Vedic ideas. Not only an attitude of reverence these Vedas have enjoyed since times immemorial but they have been looked upon as truths of supreme authority by all the great Brahmanic thinkers.

It is one of the greatest of Dayānada's contributions to our knowledge to have evolved whole of his philosophy from the Vedas themselves, especially in times when the Vedas have been very much mis-represented. One may not agree with Dayānanda

in his idea of revelation, but, at least, it must be accepted that the Vedas, which have been held in supreme esteem by so many philosophers and thinkers, cannot be mere babblings of an anthropological age. The very fact that attempts have so often been made to distort the.., to misinterpret them or to misrepresent them shows what metal they are made of. So often they have been quoted to suit one's interest, sometimes in season and sometimes out of season. Inspite of all differences, attempts have been made to adhere to them and this very tendency testifies the high value of these texts. And we shall presently see how Dayānanda has been able to evolve his system of philosophy out of them. The philosophical and logical treatment, we reserve for subsequent chapters. Here we shall give in brief the outline of Dayānanda's philosophy as expounded on the basis of the Vedas.

SPIRIT OF THE VEDIC HYMNS

To Swāmī Dayānanda, the Veda means four Saṁhitās, the Ṛk, the Yajuh, the Sāma and the Atharva, all of them being the revealed knowledge, given to humanity in the earliest part of the creation through four personalties, *Agni*, *Vāyu*, *Āditya* and *Angiras*. In this respect, he agrees with Yājñavalkya, the author of the *Śatapatha* Brāhmaṇa, and with commentators like Sāyaṇa. It is not a place here to deal with so many differences of opinions regarding the composition of the Vedas, and the time to which they relate. It is not within the domain of a critical book on philosophy to deal with the oriental, literary or historical aspects. Dayānanda believes that the Vedas are divine fountain heads of all true knowledge. Even if we consider them not as divine but human, we cannot agree with many of the hypotheses propounded in their connection.

The general tendency of the modern age is to discuss every subject from an evolutionary point of view. Even if it be accepted, we cannot submit to a number of notions which have become current since the western scholarship occupied itself to the Vedic problems. It has been maintained that different portions of the Ṛgvedic hymns were written in different times. It may be so, but uplil now this view has not been substantiated. The linguistic, the grammatical, the poetic, the anthropological, the socialistic, the astronomical and similar many considerations on the basis of which the hymns could have been classified time-wise do not corroborate each other. Any inference drawn on only one consideration is faulty and unreliable. As there has never been established a coherence between so diverse points of view, I would say, it still belongs to the category of a mere hypothesis that hymns of the Ṛgveda were composed at different times and probably at different places.

The Ṛgveda can in no way be regarded as a primaeval book of the human civilisation. Apart from the subject-matter, the very form of it denies this hypothesis. It was compsed at a time when we possessed not only a workable but almost perfect language. In fact, we do not know exactly what perfectness of a language means,—the language was perfect in this respect that all ideas could be beautifully conveyed through it It possessed much more of the grammatical forms than many of the living European languages possess. The Ṛgveda was composed at a time when people had an idea of prosody too. They knew and appreciated chanting also. The beautiful arrangement of words from a phonetic point speaks very highly of their taste. A humn race possessing so complete a language, so advanced a grammar, and so highly

developed a taste for rhythm and rhyme cannot be called a primitive race. From the first to the tenth book of the Ṛgveda, and from the Ṛgveda to the Atharva, if one devotes himself with minuteness, he is sure to be impressed by the advanced nature of those who were responsible for bringing out these hymns to light.

So much linguistic advancement, full of highly evolved taste, could not have been developed in a primaeval society. It speaks very high of the organisation of those people who could evolve such a high class literature. The Ṛgveda deals with the perfect form of morality, over which even after the laps of thousands of years no improvement could be made. Then, who can agree with Pfleiderer who speaks of the "primaeval child-like nāive prayer of the Ṛgveda." If these prayers were chid-like, the vocabulary should have been also of a primaeval child, consisting of only a few words, and the expressions also of a nāive child. But think of the vocabulary of the Ṛgveda ; it comprises almost whole of the Vedic language, perhaps it has got the richest vocabulary that any single book of the world can possess. If it is still child-like, it must be a monstrous child.

Bloomfield maintains that the hymns of the Ṛgveda are sacrificial compositions of a primitive race which attached great importance to ceremonial rites. This view is equally misrepresenting. Firstly, it tentatively starts with the assumption that it is only a primitive race which possesses a vast store of ceremonial rites. This is wrong. At least, the modern Europe is not primitive. If a collection of all the ceremonials concerning coronation, baptism, military ceremonies, state processions and receptions, parliamentary oaths and so many others prevalent in democratic and imperialistic societies be collected,

it can very well equal in massiveness the Ṛgvedic collection. Moreover, it is wrong to suppose that at each and every step a Ṛg-hymn deals with one or the other ceremony. It is correct that Ṛg-vedic hymns have been used, and Yajuḥ hymns still more, for ceremonial purposes, but it does not mean that they were exclusively meant for it. One has to judge them from the other view-points. Think of their sublimity. I have personal experience that in many ceremonies such hymns are chanted which either consist of very charming prayers, or sometimes convey very deep thoughts. Simply because they have been used in a particular ceremony, it is erroneous to pronounce them as primitive. Dayānanda is very clear on this point and he emphatically contradicts any such notion. The view of Bergaigne is somewhat nearer the truth. He holds that they were all allegorical. Certainly in some hymns there are beautiful allegories too, but generally these allegories are simple and clear.

Dayānanda says that "the Vedas deal with four subjects : *Vijñāna* or the supreme knowledge, *Karma* or duties, *Upāsanā* or worship and *Jñāna* or the empirical knowledge. Of these, the subject of supreme knowledge is the main. It deals with the direct realisation of all, ranging from God to the minutest particle. Of this also, main is the knowledge of God."

MONOTHEISM

Dayānanda has at many places in his writings refuted the fact that the Vedic hymns propound either polytheism, henotheism or the so-understood *devatā-vāda*. Radhakrishnan agrees with him when he writes :—

"An important point to be borne in mind in

discussion is this that the world *deva* is so very elusive in its nature and is used to indicate many different things. '*Deva* is one who *gives* to man.' God is *Deva* because He gives the whole world. The learned man who imparts knowledge to fellow-man is also a *deva*. The sun, the moon and the sky are *devas* because they give light to all creation. Father and mother and spiritual guides are also *devas*. Even a guest is *deva*."

The following extract from Dayānanda's book, the *Satyārtha-prakāśa*, will throw some light on this question. He puts it in the form of questions and answers :—

Q.—There are more gods than one mentioned in the Vedas. Do you believe this or not ?

A.—No, we do not ; as nowhere in all the four Vedas there is written any thing that goes to show that there are more gods than one. On the other hand, it is clearly said in many places that there is only one God.

Q.—What is meant by the mention of various *devatās* in the Vedas then ?

A.—Whatsoever or whosoever possesses useful and brilliant qualities is called a *devatā*, as the earth for instance ; but it is nowhere said that it is God or is the object of our adoration. .....They are greatly mistaken who take the word *devatā* to mean God. He is called *devatā* of *devatās*—greatest of all *devatās*—because He alone is the author of creation, sustenance and dissolution of the Universe, the Great Judge and Lord of all. The Vedic text[1] "The Lord of all, the ruler

1. त्रयस्त्रिंशता स्तुवत भूतान्यशाम्यन्प्रजापतिः परमेष्ठ्यधिपतिरासीत् । (Yv. 14, 31)

of the Universe, the sustainer of all, holds all things by means of thirty-three *devatās*" has been explained as follows in the fourteenth chapter of the Śatapatha Brāhmana : (*i*) Heated cosmic bodies, (*ii*) planets, (*iii*) atmosphere, (*iv*) super-terrestrial space, (*v*) suns, (*vi*) rays of ethereal space, (*vii*) satellites, (*viii*) stars ; these eight are called *vasus*, because they are the abode of all that lives, moves or exists. The eleven *Rudras* are the ten *prāṇas*—nervauric forces, enlivening the human body, and the eleventh is the human spirit. These are called *Rudras*, because when they desert the body, it becomes dead and the relations of the deceased, consequently, begin to weep. The twelve months of a year are called *Ādityas*, as they cause the lapse of the term of existence of each object or being. The all-pervading electricity is called *Indra* as it is productive of great force. *Yajña* is called *Prajāpati* because it benefits mankind by the purification of air, water, rain and vegetables and because it aides the development of various arts, and because in it the honour is accorded to the learned and the wise.

These thirty-three aforesaid entities are called *devatās* by virtue of possessing enlightened properties. Being Lord of all and greater than all, the Supreme Being is called the thirty-fourth *devatā* who alone is to be worshiped. The same thing is given in other *śastras*. Had people consulted these works, they would not have fallen into this error, *viz.*, the belief that there are more gods than one mentioned in the Vedas.

The Yajurveda says[1] :

By one supreme ruler is this universe pervaded, even every world in the whole circle of nature. He is the true God. Fear him, O man, and covet not unjustly the wealth of any creature existing.

God teaches in the Veda[2] :

I, O men, lived before the whole universe came into being. I am Lord of all, I am the eternal cause of the whole creation. I am the source and giver of all wealth. Let all men look upto me alone as children do to their parents. I have appointed different foods and drinks for all creatures to give them sustenance so that they may live in happiness.

I am God almighty, I am the light of the world like the sun. Neither defeat nor death can ever approach me. I am the controller of the universe; know me alone as the creator of all. Strive ye diligently for the acquisition of power and wealth such as true knowledge. Ask ye of me. May ye never lose my friendship.[3]

Another *mantra* says[4] :

God, O men, existed in the beginning of the crea-

1. ईशावास्यमिदꣳसर्वं यत्किञ्च जगत्याञ्जगत् । तेन त्यक्तेन भुञ्जीथा मा गृधः कस्यस्विद्धनम् ॥ (Yv. 40, 1)

2. अहं भुव वसुनः पूर्व्यस्पतिरहं धनानि सं जयामि शश्वत : । मां हवन्ते पितरं न जन्तवोऽहं दाशुषे विभजामि भोजनम् ॥ (Rv. X. 48, 1)

3. अहमिन्द्रो न पराजिग्य इद्धनं न मृत्यवेऽव तस्थे कदाचन । सोममिन्मा सुन्वन्तो याचता वसु न मे पूरवः सख्ये रिषाथन ॥ (Rv. X. 48, 5)

4. हिरण्यगर्भः समवर्त्तताग्रे भूतस्य जातः पतिरेक आसीत् । स दाधार पृथिवीं द्यामुतेमां कस्मै देवाय हविषा विधेम ॥ (Rv. X, 121, 1)

tion. He is the creator, support and the sustainer of the sun and other luminous worlds. He was the Lord of the past creation. He is the Lord of the present. He will be the Lord of the yet unborn universe. He created the whole world, and He sustains it. He is eternal bliss. May ye all praise and adore Him as we do.

The Ṛgveda says[1] :

He is one, but the wise call Him by different names; such as Indra, Mitra, Varuna, Agni, Divya, Suparna, Mātariśvā, Yama, and Garutmān.

The Yajuh at another place[2] says :

He verily is Agni, the same He is Āditya, the same He is Vāyu, the same He is Chandramā, the same He is Śukra. He is Āpah and He is Prajāpati.

Dayānanda has very clearly elucidated in the first chapter of the *Satyārthaprakāśa* how hundred different terms, according to the context, can be used to mean God, when taken etymologically. He holds that such terms which apparently mean *devatās* have been sometimes used in the Vedic texts to mean God and sometimes other worldly objects. "A word ought to be taken to mean what fits in with the occasion, circumstances and the subject under discussion."

MONISM *vs.* THREE ETERNALS

Dayānanda believes in monotheism, that is, in the existence of only one God. In fact, the concep-

1. इन्द्रं मित्रं वरुणमग्निमाहुरथो दिव्यः स सुपर्णो गरुत्मान् । एकं सद्विप्रा बहुधा वदन्त्यग्निं यमं मातरिश्वानमाहुः ॥ (Rv. I, 164, 46)

2. तदेवाग्नि० (Yv. 32, 1)

tion of the plurality is against the very idea of God Himself. It appears to be clear that the idea of neo-Vedantism is absent in the Veda. Without the help of the indescribable *Māyā* the neo-Vedantic doctrine cannot be substantiated. *Māyā* in the sense of *avidyā* or the cause of illusion has never been used in the Vedas. In this connection, I may refer my readers to the small book "The Doctrine of *Māyā*" by Dr. Prabhudatta Śāstri. The word has occured about 70 times in Ṛgveda under various forms and at about 27 places in Atharva. At all these places, Yāska, Sāyana and Dayānanda, all the three agree that the word means *Prajñā, Jñāna-viśeṣa* or specific knowledge. Uvvaṭ has translated the word "*Āsuri māyā*" at one place in Yajurveda as "*Prāna-sambandhinī Prajñā*" or the knowledge concerning the vital air. Radhakrishnan writes in connection with hymns of Ṛgveda that "wherever the word *Māyā* occurs it is used only to signify the might or the power."

The Veda believes in the reality of the world. In words of Radhakrishnan again : "We see clearly that there is no basis of any conception of the unreality of the world in the hymns of the Ṛgveda. The world is not a purposeless phantasm, but is just the evolution of God." The relation of lower souls to God is very well described in the following *mantras* :—

The one in whom in the third stage, the elevated ones having obtained immortality lead a free life, that He is our *Bandhu* or friend or brother, the giver of life, the sustainer, and He alone knows all the abodes and worlds.[1]

O Agni, as a father to son, you be to us easily

1. स नो बन्धुर्जनिता स विधाता धामानि वेद भुवनानि विश्वा ।
यत्र देवा अमृतमानशानास्तृतीये धामन्नध्यैरयन्त ॥
(Yv. 32, 10)

approachable. Take us with you for our prosperity[1].

He created knowledge for his *ever living* kingdom[2].

(O Souls !) You know him not, who has created all this. There has ever been a difference between you and Him. You have been ruthlessly indulging in mal-conversations, self-conceit and evil desires.[3] (Yv. 17,31)

On this Dayānanda comments, specially on *Yadyushmākamanataram babhūva* :—

> "That Brahman and we souls, are these one or not ? The answer is : The identity of Brahman and *Jiva* can never be established either by reasoning or the Vedic authority, because *Jiva* has been different from Brahman from the very beginning. *Jiva* is full of *avidyā* and other deficiencies, while Brahman is not. Therefore, it is clear that neither *Jiva* and Brahman were one, nor they are and nor they will ever be. Moreover, the relation between Brahman and *Jiva* is one of the pervading and the pervaded, base and the based, master and the servant, and, therefore, it is not proper for anybody to call Brahman and *Jiva* one." (*Āryābhivinaya*, 44)

Dayānanda believes in three eternals : the God, Souls and the *Prakṛti*. For Dayānanda, Brahman, *Iśvara, Parameśvara, Paramātman* and similar words

1. स नः पितेव सूनवेऽग्ने सूपायनो भव । सचस्वा नः स्वस्तये ॥
(Ṛv. I, 1, 9)
2. अर्थान् व्यदधाच्छाश्वतीभ्यः समाभ्यः । (Yv. 40, 8)
3. न तं विदाथ य इमा जजानान्यद्युष्माकमन्तरं बभूव ।
नीहारेण प्रावृता जल्प्या चासुतृप उक्थशासश्चरन्ति ॥
(Yv. 17, 31)

are synonyms, meaning the same God. He does not distinguish between the lower God, *Iśvara* and the Absolute Brahman. We shall take up the discussion on the subject lateron.

SCEPTICISM IN THE VEDAS

Evolutionists believe that the earliest Vedic hymns deal with naturalistic and anthropomorphic gods, while the next stage was of *devatās* or Deities with henotheistic notion, if not polytheistic. And, finally, by and by, they arrived at the monotheism. Some think that in the Vedic hymns we do not merely find 'wild imagination and fancy but also earnest thought and enquiry.' They had already developed a questioning mood. 'To others, 'the necessity to postulate a number of Gods is due to the impulse of mind which seeks to understand things instead of accepting facts as they are given to it.' A few of the questions which bewildered them were as follows : Where is the sun by night ? Where go the stars by day ? Why does the sun not fall down ? Of the two, night and day, which is the earlier and which the later ?[1] Radhakrishanan says : "The longing of the human heart could not be satisfied with a pluralistic pantheon. The doubt arose as to which god was real one *Kasmai devāya haviṣā vidhema*, to what god shall we offer our obtation ?" All this shows the earnestness of the people to have the understanding of the phe-

1. कस्य नूनं कतमस्यामृतानां मनामहे चारु देवस्य नाम ।
को नो मह्या अदितये पुनर्दात् पितरं च दृशेयं मातरं च ॥
(Ṛv. I, 24, 1)
कतरा पूर्वा कतरापरायोः कथा जाते कवयः को विवेद ।
विश्व त्मना बिभृतो यद्ध नाम वि वर्तेते अहनी चक्रियेव ॥
(Ṛv. I, 185, 1)

nomena within which they have been placed. Some authors point out a few instances of scepticism in the Vedic hymns. For example: "Who has seen the first-born, when he that had no bones bore him that has bones ? Where is the life, the blood, the self of the universe ? Who went to ask of any who knew ?"[1] (Ṛv. 1.164,4)

Dayānanda does not see any scepticism in these passages. In this connection, it may be stated that at many places, where a question has been put, the answer of the question also is placed in the proximity. The question, for instance, "*Kasmaī deyāya haviṣā vidhema*" was not such of which the answer was not known. The very *mantra* says : "*Ya ātmadā baladā yasya viśva upāsate yasyachchāyāmṛtam yasya mṛtyuḥ*," that is, to what god shall we offer our oblation ?—to one who gives spirituality and strength, whose shelter is immortality and otherwise death.[2] At some places, the sceptic question is the answer by itself, for after all everything in the world is not knowable, and sometimes we can answer only by contradictions. These contradictions imply truth. For

1. को ददर्श प्रथमं जायमानमस्थन्वन्तं यदनस्था बिभर्ति ।
भूम्या असुरसृगात्मा क्वस्वित्को विद्वांसमुप गात्प्रष्टुमेतत् ॥
(Ṛv. I, 164, 4)

2. Another similar instance : *Kasit prama pratima kim nidanamajyma kimasit paridhih ka asit. Chhandah kimasit pra-ugam kimuktham yaddeva devamayajanta visve* (*Rv. X, 130, 3*), Who is *prama*, which is the *pratima*—the measure of knowledge, the standard—which is the cause, which is the essence, which is the *paridhi*, the circumscribed, which is *chhanda*, who is adorable ? Of these seven questions, the single answer follows : the very Lord whom all the learned adore. Dayananda writes : "the one whom all the learned adore have been adoring and will adore, the verily He is *prama* etc."

Similarly, in the Yajurveda : *Kigvam svidasidadhishthanamarambhanam katamatsvit kathasit. Yato bhumim janayan vishvakarma vidyamaurnonmahina vishvachakshah.* (Yv. 17,18).

example, the following extract from the Nāsadīya hymn :

"Who then knows, who has declared it here, from whence was born this creation ? The learned came later than this creation, who then knows whence it arose ?" (Ṛv. X, 129, 6)

"He from whom this creation arose, whether he made it or did not make it, the highest seer in the highest heaven, he forsooth knows, or does even he not know ?" (Ṛv. X,129,7).

The answer of all these questions is implied in questions themselves. Where the doubt is experssed, it simply signifies the limitations of humanity regarding the solution of such problems. In a poetic way, one is transcending his limitations on the omniscient Himself. In fact, the words "*Asyādhyakṣaḥ parame vyoman*" speak of the Lord He with certainty, but to argue further about His ways certainly leads to scepticism. Such scepticism regarding the thorough quest of that He is not scepticism ; it is the real knowledge. The unknowability is His knowledge. Becoming sceptic about Him and His ways after having striven to know Him is the ultimate knowledge ; in the words of the Upaniṣad "*Yo nastadveda tadveda, yo na vedeti veda cha.*" One who knows that he knows knows not, and one who knows that he knows not might be knowing something. We simply know that God is at the basis of all the phenomena but to argue in details is always difficult.

THE WORLD A REALITY YET CHANGEABLE

We have just said that 'there is no basis for any conception of the unreality of the world in the hymns of the Ṛgveda. The world is not a purposeless phantasm.' We reserve the discussion of 'reality' for another chapter. Here we shall only try to impress that

all the four Vedas take it for granted that the world is real. It is not a matter of delusion that we actually see, hear, move and talk, and feel pain and pleasure. We are anxious to live happily and live a long life—a life of peace and prosperity. The Veda says: *Paśyema śaradaḥ śatam ; śṛṇuyāma śaradaḥ śatam ; prabravāma śaradaḥ śatam; jivema Śaradaḥ śatam.* Let us live for hundred years, may we see for hundred years, may we hear for hundred years and may we talk for hundred years and even more. This prayer does not imply that what we see with eyes is a delusion, what we hear with our ears is simply an echo in the bewilderment, what we speak with our tongue is not a speech at all, nor the place where we lead our life is simply an enchantment or an empty dream. If our five sense are deceptive or what they receive is not truth, then where was the necessity of praying: "*Bhadram Karṇebhih śṛṇuyāma devāḥ, bhadram paśyemakṣbhiryajatraḥ.* —May we hear happy talks through our ears and may we see happy scenes through our eyes."

According to the Vedas, our mortal life has a purpose. The purpose is to attain immortality and to subdue death. Mortality is as good a truth as immortality, truth in the sense that it really exists. Had it not existed, where was the bondage and the question of freedom from bondage would have been futile. The world is unreal only in the sense that it is changing. The Veda says: '*Jagatyām jagat*', that is, the world is changeable. Life in bondage means a change, for otherwise there would have been no purpose of life in bondage. Life in bondage is not an accident, nor can anybody deny the very existence of bondage. When the Veda says: *Avidyayā mṛtyum tīrtvā vidyayāmṛtamasnute*, that is, one overcomes death by *Avidyā* or *Karma*, the righteous actions, and attains immortality by *Vidyā* or knowledge, the Veda makes us believe that there is as

much a certainty of death as of immortality. So often the *Vedamantras* speak of the Lord as *Janitā* or *Vidhātā*—the creator or the sustainer, but never with the idea that the Lord is the creator or sustainer of the delusion. When the Veda says about the Lord: "*dhātā yathā pūrvamakalpayat*—the world has been created as before or the Lord is the creator of the endless cycles, the world has not been supposed to be a phantasm. When the Veḍa says : "*Kurvanneveha Karmāṇi jijīviṣet*", aspire for life with activity, how the life be taken as unreal or non-existing ?

The reality of life or our purpose of it is very clearly given in the following *mantra* of the Ṛgveda. We shall give it in the words of Dayānanda. Dayānanda begins with a question :

Q.—How many entities are eternal or beginningless ?

A.—Three : God, the Soul and the *Prakṛti.*

Q.—What are your authorities for this statement?

A.—Ṛgveda[1] says : "Both God and Soul are eternal ; they are alike in consciousness and such other attributes. They are associated together, God pervading the Soul, and are mutual companions. The *Prakṛti*, which likened to the trunk of a tree, whose branches are the multiform universe which is resolved into its elementary condition at the time of dissolution, is also etrenal. The natures, attributes, and characters of these three are also eternal. Of the two, God and the Soul, the latter alone reaps the fruit of this tree of the universe—

1. द्वा सुपर्णा सयुजा सखाया समानं वृक्षं परिषस्वजाते ।
तयोरन्यः पिप्पलं स्वाद्वायनश्नन्नन्यो अभिचाकशीति ॥
(Ṛv. 1, 164, 20)

good or evil, whilst the former does not. He is the all-glorious Being who shines within, without and all round. God, the Soul, and the *Prakṛti* all these are distinct from one another, being different in their natures, but they are all eternal.

This *mantra* clearly signifies the relationship of the world with God and the souls ; all of them are *sayujā sakhā*, the co-mates of the same age, both eternal, attached to the *samāna vṛkṣa*, the tree of the same age, the tree of *prakṛti* which is also eternal. All of them are equally real, so far as their entity is concerned. There is only one who tastes the fruit of this tree ; he is the lower soul, while the other keeps a watch over him.

WHENCEFORTH THIS CREATION?

What do we understand by creation ? This is a difficult question to answer. The biblical sense of the verb 'to create' would mean 'to produce out of nothing'. What was existing, before this world came into being ? Is it stationary, undergoing no change ? Is it still in the state of becoming ? Are the processes of destruction also going on ? In fact, what do we understand by creation ? Unless we follow what creation is, we cannot ask: Whenceforth this creation ? We leave many of these questions for future discussion.

In connection with the *Nāsadīya sūkta* of the Ṛgveda, Dayānanda writes as follows in the cosmology-chapter of his book *Ṛgvedādibhāṣyabhūmikā* :

"Whatever in this whole world is visible, it has been orderly created by God. He is the sustainer of it and during *pralaya*—annihilation—He destroys it after decomposition ; He then again creates the world in the same way.

"When this caused cosmos was not born, the *asat* (the void, *ākāśa* before the creation) was also not existing. How? Because at that time it was not in use. At that time, *Sat*, the *vyakta* cause of the world, an aspect of the *avyakta prakṛti* was also non-existent. (Dayānanda means that though *prakṛti* was existing in its *avyakta* form, the *sat* of it was not manifested, *cf.*, Sāmkhya) Nor were the *paramāṇus* (*raja*) existing. Nor the *vyoma or Virāṭ* (the cosmic form) was existing. But the only thing that existed was that Great Brahman's the so-called vitality, which is very subtle and which is the primordial cause.

"In mornings, during the rainy season, just something resembling smoke with a little rainy water content appears, and just as this much quantity of water is incapable to wrap the earth or to make a river flow, similarly what covered? (All that was existing was insufficient to cover the whole Brahman; it was just an insignificant portion.) The primordial cause could not cover the whole Brahman in the same way. How? Because Brahman is infinite while the world is infinitesimal."

In the same *sūkta*, other things that are described to be non-existing are death or *Mṛtyu*; and immortality (*amṛta*); and also there was no distinction between night and day.

The thing that existed was: that one which breathed by itself (*svadhayā*) without breath, Other than it, there had been nothing. (This one is the lower soul, who being *chetana* was living without a corporeal body, without *prāṇa* or breath.)

Now the creation begins: It became all dark. In the beginning, there appeared *apraketa salila* (something fluid which could not be discriminated—a sea

without light). That one who was living by itself without breath so far, as if a germ covered by husk, came into life by the *tapas* or heat. Then came into being love (*kāma*) which was a seed of mind and since then this creation rolled on.

All this when summed up would mean that there pre-existed three things:

One, which supplied power or vitality, which underwent *tapas*. This is God.

The second, though living but breathing without breath or existing without corporeal body. This is the Soul.

The third thing, which appeared to be non-existing in its *vyakta* form in the beginning but which finally condensed and which supplied corporeal body to that germ. This is *Prakṛti*.

These form Dayānanda's three eternals. And now we can answer the question: 'Whenceforth this creation came into being? From all the three, God, the Soul and the *Prakṛti*. There would have been no creation had even one non-existed. Had there been no God, *Prakṛti* would have remained *avyakta* or unmanifested, because who else could have given it the initial motive *tapas*, heat or vitality. Had there been no *Prakṛti*, whereupon the *tapas* would have acted, and had there been no soul urging for life in a corporeal body, the creation would have been purposeless.

Some interpreters ascribe the statement "That one breathed by itself without breath; other than it, there has been nothing" to Brahman, the Absolute. But it is not so. It stands for lower souls, for whom without creation, death and immortality both would have been meaningless. In their connection, it has been said—"There was no death, and hence was nothing immortal." The same souls were given the

corporeal body in which *manas* and *kāma* were provided.

I agree with Radhakrishnan in so far that "We find in this hymn a representation of the most advanced theory of creation. First of all, there was no existent or non-existent. The existent in its manifested aspect was not then. We cannot on that account call it the non-existent, for it is positive being from which the whole existence arrives." I submit that in the detailed interpretation of the hymn, we differ.

It is further said at another place[1] :

Before all, the one who was existing was Hiraṇya-garbha, the only Lord, the sustainer of the earth, the sky and every thing. The word Hiraṇyagarbha is significant. It is a composite term for God and *Prakṛti*, the one who holds *Prakṛti*, the gold, in womb or *garbha*. It signifies the simultaneous existence of God and *Prakṛti*.

At another place[2], God has been called Viśva-karmā (Yajuḥ 31, 17). In the beginning existed Viśvakarmā, who having taken the essence out of water made the earth. He gave form to the world and also body to the mortals so that they may become immortals, or *devas*, through it.

The same God is Prajāpati[3]. (Yajuḥ 31, 19)

---

1. हिरण्यगर्भः समवर्त्तताग्रे भूतस्य जातः पतिरेक आसीत् ।
   स दाधार पृथिवीं द्यामुतेमां कस्मै देवाय हविषा विधेम ।
   (Rv. X, 121, 1)
2. अद्भ्यः संभृतः पृथिव्यै रसाच्च विश्वकर्मणः समवर्त्तताग्रे ।
   तस्य त्वष्टा विदधद्रूपमेति तन्मर्त्यस्य देवत्वमाजानमग्रे ॥
3. प्रजापतिश्चरति गर्भे अन्तरजायमानो बहुधा विजायते ।
   तस्य योनिं परिपश्यन्ति धीरास्तस्मिन् ह तस्थुर्भुवनानि विश्वा॥
   (Yv. 31, 19)

The Prajāpati pervades in and out everywhere and gives various forms to this world, though himself remains unborn. The wise see into Him the root cause. In Him alone, different worlds are getting support.

Atharva says[1] that from Prajāpati are born (*i*) *parama*, the highest, the world etc., (*ii*) *avama*, the lowest, straw, small creatures etc., and (*iii*) *madhyama*, the middle, man's body etc., all these forms. In this creation of the three kinds, the Lord is permeating to an indefinite extent. How can there be a measure of it ?

Needless to say that Hiraṇyagarbha, Prajāpati, Viśvakarmā and similar terms have been used in the same sense. All these terms in a way are synonyms, meaning something or the other concerning creation. We cannot agree to the statements as follow :

"In the pluralistic stage, the several gods, Varuna, Indra, Agni, Viśvakarman, were looked upon as the authors of the Universe. The method of creation is differently conceived. Some gods are supposed to build the world as the carpenter builds a house. The question is raised as to how the tree or the wood, out of which the work was built, was obtained (Rv. 10, 31, 7; 10, 81, 4).[2] At a later stage, the answer is given that Brahman is the tree and the wood out of which heaven and earth are made. The concep-

---

1. यत्परममवमं यच्च मध्यमं प्रजापतिः ससृजे विश्वरूपम् ।
   कियता स्कम्भः प्रविवेश तत्र यन्न प्राविशत् कियत्तद् बभूव ॥
   (Av. 10, 7, 8)
2. किं स्विद्वनं क उ स वृक्ष आस यतो द्यावापृथिवी निष्टतक्षुः ।
   सन्तस्थाने अजरे इत ऊती अहानि पूर्वीरुषसो जरन्त ॥
   (Rv. X, 31, 7)

tion of organic growth[1] or development is also now and then suggested (Ṛv. 10, 123, I). Sometimes the gods are said to create the world by the power of sacrifice. This perhaps belongs to a later stage of thought." (Radhakrishnan, *Indian Philosophy*, I, 99).

An allegorical evolution of the cosmos has been given in *Puruṣa sūkta* of the Yajurveda, which we have no occasion to deal with in details. We shall conclude this account of cosmology after having considered one *mantra*[2] here which involves some controversy. Dayānanda has treated this *sūkta* almost completely in his Ṛgvedādibhaṣyabhūmikā. The fifth *mantra* of this *sūkta* when translated ordinarily would mean :

From that (*puruṣa*) was born *virāṭ* and from *virāṭ* again the *puruṣa*. He having born remains aloof ; having given birth to the earth he sustains it afterwards.

From this passage, some are apt to think that "*Puruṣa* is the begetter as well as the begotten. He is the absolute as well as the self-conscious one." In this connection, Dayānanda says : "From 'O that' (*tataḥ*) means 'from the one with cosmic body whose eyes are the sun and the moon, breath the air, foot the earth, and so on, from that *samaṣṭi-deha*.' This Lord of the Cosmic Body gave birth to *virāṭ*.' From this *virāṭ* were born other *puruṣas*. From various elements of *Brahmāṇḍa* were made different bodies for all souls fit for their use."

---

1. अयं वेनश्चोदयत्पृश्निगर्भा ज्योतिर्जरायू रजसो विमाने ।
इममपां संगमे सूर्यस्य शिशुं न विप्रा मतिभी रिहन्ति ॥
(Ṛv, X. 123, 1)

2. ततो विराडजायत विराजो अधि पूरुषः ।
स जातो अत्यरिच्यत पश्चाद् भूमिमथो पुरः ॥
(Yv. 31, 5)

Thus we have seen that in matters of cosmology, Dayānanda's contentions are very much different from those of others. The main difference is due to the following reasons : According to Dayānanda, creation cannot arise out of nothing. And, secondly, the absolute unchangeable Brahman could not be transformed to this changeable cosmos. Lastly, the world, which starts with one Brahman alone, would have been purposeless. Dayānanda presents the realistic picture of the universe, and this also leads to some differences.

VEDIC ESCHATOLOGY

Some orientalists would probably object to my adding the word 'Vedic' before eschatology or the doctrine which deals with the life after death or with the plurality of lives. They would say that the Vedic Aryans had no notions of life after death. A great scholar writes as follows : "The Vedic Aryans entered India in the pride of strength and joy of conquest. They loved life in its fullness. They, therefore, showed no great interest in the future of the soul. Life to them was bright and joyous free from all the vexations of a fretful spirit. They were not enamoured of death. They wished for themselves and their posterity a life of a hundred autumns. They had no special doctrines about life after death, though some vague conceptions about heaven and hell could not be avoided by reflective minds. Re-birth is still at a distance. The Vedic Aryans were convinced that death was not the end of things. After night, the day ; after death, life. Beings who once had been, could never cease to be. They must axist somewhere, perhaps in the realm of the setting sun where Yama rules." (Radhakrishnan's *Indian Philosophy*).

This view is not of Radhakrishnan's originally but has been given by a number of western orientalists.

We shall presently see, at least Dayānanda has shown, that like so many other doctrines, the root idea of eschatology is present in theVedas. From everyday experience, the Vedic Aryans were sure that death is inevitable and one should aspire for a long life, sometimes a life extending to the span of three ordinary lives :

Tryāyuṣām jamadagneḥ kaśyapasya tryāyuṣam.

Yaddeveṣu tryāyuṣam tanno astu tryāyuṣam. (Yajuḥ 3,62)

The ordinary life was supposed to be of one hundred autumns. It was also a contention of the people of the age that the death was not an end of life. They must have equally believed that as souls are eternal, there must be some life before this life. Like semetic religions, they never thought that it was God who breathed his life into the body of mortals. So, three things were sure. Firstly, there was life before this life ; secondly, the death is inevitable, and lastly, the death is not an end of life. The very idea, that there was an existence before this mortal life, leads one to the belief that then there would be a similar life after death also.

The Aryans knew that one cannot live for an eternal period. But then, what does it mean : '*Mṛtyum tīrtvā, amṛtamaśnute*, having overcome death by one, obtaining immortality by the other ? All those who die will not become immortals, only a chosen few being favoured with immortality. Others even after death will remain under the clutches of Death. If there is no life after death, where is the fear of a second death ? The crave for immortality is futile, specially when one is sure that the present life cannot be extended indefinitely. Therefore, the very fact that the Vedic Aryans craved for immortality beyond this death means that they believed in two things : Firstly, under ordinary

course, one will be re-born and undergo repeated mortalities. Secondly, with special favour, by leading the life of righteousness, he can be relieved from further mortalities and be immortal. This is the complete doctrine of eschatology.

When the Veda says : "*Tameva viditvatimṛtyumeti*" , or having known Him, one conquers death (Yajuḥ 31,18), it clearly means that one is relieved from the cycle of death. Conquering death means conquering subsequent deaths, for death in the present life is inevitable. Similarly, when one says "*Yasyacchhāyāmṛtam yasya mṛtyuḥ*," one whose protection leads to immortality, otherwise death, here too immortality means getting relieved from the further cycles of birth and death. It is the same thing that the *Śatapatha* speaks out : "*Mṛtyormāmṛtam gamaya*"–from death lead us to immortality. Had there been no birth after this death, the question of immortality would not have arisen. The crave for immortality for a period after death necessarily involves many births and deaths under an ordinary coruse.

Until western scholars pointed it out that the Vedic age had no idea of eschatological doctrine, no Indian ever dreamt that the principle of the transmigration of soul would be foreign to the Vedic thought. Dayānanda has given a number of instances from the Vedas which contain the eschatological principle.

The Ṛgveda says :

O, the Giver of breath, the blissful God, give to us *again* (in the next life) the eyes, *again* the vital *prāṇa*—the breath, so that we may accomplish our *bhoga* (the fruit of our present actions) ; may we always see the sun. O *Anumate*, the giver of glory,

may we have all the bliss.[1]

Here eyes are the representative of all the five senses and organs of action, and *Prāṇa* of the breath system. Another body is demanded because it is the abode of fruit of our actions or enjoyments, "*Bhogāyatanam śariram*". This *mantra* deals with the *Punarjanma,* the re-birth.

The same idea is more vividly exposed in the following *mantra*[2] of the Yajurveda (4,15) :

Again the mind, *again* the full age, *again* the breath and *again* the self-possession may we obtain. *Again* the eye, *again* the ear may we get. The Vaiśvānara or the Lord of all, devoid of all evils, the sustainer of our bodies (*Tanūpaḥ*), the *Agni,* may He protect us from all evils.

There can be no clearer a demand of a good re-birth than what has been given in this *mantra.*

The Atharvaveda[3] (5,1, 2) is also equally clear in this respect :

One who in the first (life) does actions unto *dharma* or righteous dictates, on that account he obtains

1. असुनीते पुनरस्मासु चक्षुः पुनः प्राणमिह नो धेहि भोगम् ।
ज्योक् पश्येम सूर्य्यमुच्चरन्तमनुमते मृडया नः स्वस्ति ॥
(Ṛv. X, 59, 6)
2. पुनर्मनः पुनरायुर्म आगन् पुनः प्राणः पुनरात्मा म आगन् ।
पुनश्चक्षु पुनः श्रोत्रं म आगन् । वैश्वानरो अदब्धस्तनूपा
अग्निर्नः पातु दुरितादवद्यात् ॥ (Yv. 4, 15)
3. आ यो धर्माणि प्रथमः ससाद ततो वपूंषि कृणुषे पुरूणि ।
धास्युर्योनिं प्रथम आविवेशा यो वाचमनुदितां चिकेत ॥
(Av. 5, 1, 2)

good bodies in the (next) life. That soul, after leaving the first, enters into the (next) *yoni* or womb. There, having known the true godly speech, he enjoys.

This *mantra* refers to the fact that the nature of the next birth depends on the actions done in the previous birth. It expounds the doctrine of *Karma.*

Another *mantra*[1] of the Atharva (7, 67, 1) says :

May we again obtain the senses or organs, the self-possession, the wealth, and the knowledge, again the fires. May we get all as we have been getting so far, so that we may be able to lead good life.

Prof. Rānāde refers to a hymn of the Ṛgveda in connection with eschatology. He says : "We have one very characteristic hymn of the Ṛgveda which, we fear, has not been noticed with even a tithe of the attention which it really deserves. The meaning which Ṛoth, Bohtlingk and Geldner have found in at least two verses of the hymn has been strangely overlooked, and it is wonderful that people keep saying that the idea of transmigration is *not* to be found in the Ṛgveda. The hymn we refer to is the great riddle-hymn of the Ṛgveda I, 164." (*A Constructive Survey of Upaniṣadic Philosophy*, p. 147). The verses referred to are 30th, 38th and we can include the verse 31st also of this *Sūkta,* The poet asks in one of the earlier verses, who has ever seen the precise mode in which the boneless soul, the very life-blood and informing spirit of the earth, comes to inhabit a body tenement.[2] It shows that

1. पुनर्मैत्विन्द्रियं पुनरात्मा द्रविणं ब्राह्मणं च ।
पुनरग्नयो धिष्ण्या यथास्थाम कल्पन्तामिहैव ॥
(Av. 7, 67, 1)
2. को ददर्श प्रथमं जायमानमस्थन्वन्तं यदनस्था बिभर्ति ।
(1, 164, 4)

here the context is soul. On this, "the seer says categorically that this breathing, speedful, moving life-principle is firmly established inside the tenements of clay.[1] Moreover, he tells us that the immortal principle, conjoined with the mortal one, *moves backwards and forwards* by virtue of its natural power, but the wonder of it is, the poet goes on to say that the mortal and immortal elements keep moving ceaselessly in opposite directions, with the result that people are able to see the one, but unable to see the other."[2]

In fact these two verses were referred to by Roth, Bohtlingk and Geldner as against Oldenberg, who held that there is no mention of eschatology in the Ṛgveda. Roth and others are right in regarding that "the verses tell us that the soul is moving, speedful life-principle which comes and goes, moves and then backwards, comes in contact with the body moves from it in the opposite direction." Sāyaṇa also refers this verse (38) to eschatology.[3]

Rānāde says: "But the culminating point of the whole doctrine is reached when the poet tells us that

1. अनच्छये तुरगातु जीवमजद् ध्रुवं मध्य आ पस्त्यानाम् ।
   जीवो मृतस्य चरति स्वधाभिरमर्त्यो मर्त्येना सयोनिः ॥ (३०)
2. अपाङ् प्राङेति स्वधया गृभीतोऽमर्त्यो मर्त्येना सयोनिः ।
   ता शश्वन्ता विषूचीना वियन्त न्यन्यं चिक्युर्न निचिक्युरन्यम् ॥ ३८॥
3. अपाङेति अशुक्लं कर्मकृत्वाधो गच्छति प्राङेति ऊर्ध्वं स्वर्गादि-लोकं प्राप्नोति परमात्मैव सूक्ष्मशरीरोपाधिकः सन् नानाविधं कर्म कृत्वा तद्भोगाय जीवसंज्ञां लब्ध्वा शरीरत्रयेण सम्बद्धो लोकान्तरेषु संचरति स्थूलसूक्ष्मोभयशरीरपरिग्रहेण लोके गुणत्रयान्वितः सन् परिभ्रमति तथा च श्रूयते—गुणान्वयो यः फलकर्मकर्ता कृतस्य तस्यैव सचोपभोक्ता ॥ (सायण)

he himself saw (probably with his mind's eye) the guardian of the body, moving unerringly by backward and forward paths, clothed in collected and diffusive splendour, and that it kept on *returning frequently* inside the mundane regions.[1] That this 'guardian' is no other than the soul may be seen from the way in which verse 31 follows immediately on verse 30 which mentions the 'breathing, speedful, moving life-principle'; moreover, the frequentive (*varīvarti*) tells us the *frequency* of the soul's return to this world."

EMANCIPATION OR SALVATION

We have just seen that the Veda is positively in favour of the doctrine of eschatology. The ultimate goal of life is difficult to fix up. In our body, we all feel bondage, and think that so long as we are under the clutches of birth and death we cannot be free from pain. The Vedic seer knows that God and God alone is the source of all bliss, all strength and all pleasure. In our worldly life, we demand from Him all that we need :

O God, Thoy art the light, give us light,
Thou art the essence, give us essence of life.
Thou art the strength, give us strength,
Thou art the valour, give us valour.
Thou art the anger, give us anger.
Thou art the forbearance, give us forbearance.[2]

1. अपश्यं गोपामनिपद्यमानमा च परा च पथिभिश्चरन्तम् ।
   स सध्रीचीः स विषूचीर्वसान आ वरीवर्ति भुवनेष्वन्तः ॥३१॥
2. तेजोऽसि तेजो मयि धेहि, वीर्यमसि वीर्यं मयि धेहि ।
   बलमसि बलं मयि धेहि, ओजोऽस्योजो मयि धेहि ।
   मन्युरसि मन्युं मयि धेहि, सहोऽसि सहो मयि धेहि ॥
   (Yv. 19, 9)

Another weary soul demands :

'O light, the Lord of all, take away from us all that is evil and whatever be to our good, give us all.'[1]

Here is the demand for supreme intelligence :

'The very intellect which both elders and the learned adorned, O Agni, make us full ot that.'[2]

The man who takes the vow of truth[3] says :

'O Agni, the Lord of vows, it is only with thy help that we are able to take the vow. May we with thy grace leave untruth in order to attain truth.'

The Ṛg says :[4] To one who has not known the Lord, what would the knowing of all the knowledge (*ṛcha*) do ? Having known him alone we derive satisfaction.

In deep meditation, when a devotee becomes one with God, or gets very much absorbed in Him, he sees through all the souls, the one *Atman* pervading and in that state he can say : "Now where is the attachment and where is the agony ? There is only one Lord before him."[5]

So, what is the final goal of life ? Is it mere peace and prosperity in the present life or even something

---

1. विश्वानि देव सवितर्दुरितानि परा सुव । यद्भद्रं तन्न आसुव ।। (Ṛv. v, 82, 5)
2. यां मेधां देवगणाः पितरश्चोपासते ।
   तया मामद्य मेधयाग्ने मेधाविनं कुरु ।। (Yv. 32, 14)
3. अग्ने व्रतपते व्रतं चरिष्यामि तच्छकेयं तन्मे राध्यताम् ।
   इदमहमनृतात्सत्यमुपैमि ।। (Yv. 1, 5)
4. यस्तन्न वेद किमृचा करिष्यति य इत्तद्विदुस्त इमे समासते ।। (Ṛv. I, 164, 39)
5. तत्र को मोहः कः शोक एकत्वमनुपश्यतः । (Yv. 40, 7)

higher ? The Veda does not want us to abhor wealth or victory in ordinary life. We can pray to Him : "*Syāma patayoḥ rayīṇām*"—may we be the master of immense wealth ; but this does not give us the ultimate satisfaction. On a higher plane, we demand three things from Him—the right intellect, the truth and His direct contact. But all these things one can also possess in the mortal body, where the soul works, feels and thinks in terms of the physical body.

We have seen in the last section that there is an inner urge in us to get rid of death, which is the deadliest of the phenomena which one experiences in the mortal life. The Vedic seers have got a confidence in the attainment of an immortal life, the life of "not-death" or *amṛta*. They believe that the worldly pain and pleasure are the functions of physical body. They also realise that God is the source of all bliss. So long as one is within body, he is separated from God. This body stands between the two. And, therefore, he is anxious to get himself released from the cycle of birth and death.

When did the cycle of birth and death start with a particular soul ? Is it with him since eternity ? If it is so, how can an eternal cycle be ever ended ? How can emancipation be possible ? Then, was the soul, before he entered the cycle, emancipated ? Necessarily, if emancipation would ever exist in future, it already existed sometimes in the past. Between two emancipations is the cycle of life and death and between two such cycles there is one emancipation. We can say that there exists a wider cycle of bondage and emancipation beyond the cycle of life and death. Therefore, Dayānanda not only believes in emancipation but also in a return from emancipation. We shall discuss the subject in some other chapter.

In this connection, Dayānanda says : "It is not true that the emancipated soul never returns to this world because the Veda contradicts this view." The Ṛgveda says :[1] "Whose name shall we hold sacred? Who is that all-glorious, resplendent being? Who is imperishable among all the perishable things? Who having made us enjoy the bliss of emancipation again invests us with bodies and thereby gives us the pleasure of seeing our parents? It is all-glorious, eternal, immortal, all-pervading, Supreme Being, whose name we should hold sacr d. He it is, who helps us to enjoy the bliss of emancipation and then brings us back into this world. clothes us with bodies, and thereby gives us the pleasure of seeing our parents. The same divine spirit it is. who regulates the period of emancipation and lords over all."

According to Dayānanda, when the word *amṛta* or immortality is used, it does not denote the period of eternity. It signifies only a very long period. How can a state be extended to eternity which has a beginning?

THE VEDIC CONCEPT OF MIND

Barring the two subjects, Brahman and the soul, no other problem is so intricate as one concerning "mind." The function of mind is so prominent that sometimes the ego appears to be lost in it. It appears to be as "*chetana*" or active as ego itself. Ordinarily it does not behave as if it be material, because the physics, chemistry and biology of it are

1. कस्य नूनं कतमस्यामृतानां मनामहे चारु देवस्य नाम । को नो मह्या अदितये पुनर्दात्पितरं च दृशेयं मातरं च ।। अग्नेर्वयं प्रथमस्यामृतानां मनामहे चारु देवस्य नाम । स नो मह्या अदितये पुनर्दात्पितरं च दृशेयं मातरं च ।। (Ṛv. I, 24,1-2)

still unexplored, nor is it immaterial, for it only exists in the material body. It is a connecting link between the soul and physical world. What is mind? Is it something which knows, which feels, which thinks, which has a memory and which is active in dreams? Or, more exactly, through which the the ego knows, feels, thinks, memorises and dreams?

The Vedic concept of mind is very well given in the following set of *mantras* (Yajuḥ 34, 1-6) :

(i)

The one which runs away while awakened,
And, similarly, which runs of one asleep.
One which moves afar, which is the light of light.
That my mind be of blissful ideas.

(ii)

By which in *yajña* and on other occasions, the learned,
Wise, and the intelligent perform their actions.
One which is the best amongst the organs or senses.
That my mind be of blissful ideas.

(iii)

One which is the instrument of knowing (*prajñāna*),
Thinking (*chetaḥ*), retaining (*dhṛtiḥ*).
One which is the immortal light of all the senses.
One without which not a single deed performed.
That my mind be of blissful ideas.

(iv)

By which immortal, this past, present and future,
Appear as if all within reach.
By which is ordained this *yajña* of seven '*hotās*'.
That my mind be of blissful ideas.

(v)

In which, Ṛg. Sāma and Yajuḥ are fixed up
As if poles in the centre of a wheel.
In which the consciousness of all the senses rests.
That my mind be of blissful ideas.

(vi)

That which drags men with force, as if the good
Horse-driver controls mighty horses with reins,
Never growing old, the fast one,
That which is seated in the heart.
That my mind be of blissful ideas.

The complete working of mind has been very nicely summarised in these *mantras* which need no comment. The Veda distinguishes between mind and inteliect, while the control over both is necessary before one can realise God. The process through which it is achieved is called *yoga*. The other words which have been used in the Veda to convey the sense of *yoga* are '*Yuñjate*', '*Yuktena*' etc. The Ṛgveda[1] says :—

The devotees or *Vipra* concentrate (*yuñjate*) mind in the great and all-knowing and so do they concentrate intellect (*dhiyaḥ*).

The word '*yuñjate*' signifies the whole process of *yoga* of which 'concentrate' is not an appropriate rendering. However, it has been used in absence of any other better term.

The Yajurveda[2] also says :

The man doing *yoga* (*yuñjānaḥ*) first controls mind to attain the principle (the realisation of Brahman), and then the *Savitā*, the God Himself, directs his intellect.

---

1. युञ्जते मन उत युञ्जते धियो विप्रा विप्रस्य बृहतो विपश्चितः । वि होत्रा दधे वयुनाविदेक इन्मही देवस्य सवितुः परिष्टुतिः ॥ (Ṛv. V, ८१, १)
2. युञ्जानः प्रथमं मनस्तत्त्वाय सविता धियम् । अग्नेर्ज्योतिर्निचाय्य पृथिव्या अध्याभरत् ॥ (Yv. 11, 1)

The same idea is developed in other two *mantras* following the above one in the Yajurveda (*yukten manasā vayam* and *yuktāya savītā devān*).

The Atharva describes *yoga* a little more in details (19,8,2).[1]

The blissful, pleasure-giving, twentyeight may devote themselves, day and night, to attain *yoga*. *Yoga* leads to *kṣema* and *kṣema* leads to *yoga*.

Kṣema means the competency obtained by *yoga* which is the name of practice. Practice leads to competency and competency encourages for further practice. The 'twentyeight' referred to in the passage signify—

Five organs of sense.

Five organs of action.

Four—mind, intellect, thought-provoking one, nad self-provoking one (*manas, buddhi, chitta* and *ahamkāra*).

Ten vital breaths—*prāṇa, apāna, vyāna, udāna, samāna, nāga, kūrma, kṛkala, devadatta, ḍhanañjaya.*

Four sundry—*Vidyā* or knowledge, *svabhāva* or habit, *śarira* or the body, and *bala* or the strength.

THE VEDIC ETHICS

We shall conclude this chapter by giving an outline of the Vedic ethics. We, however, cannot discuss the various implications which arise in ethics in the course of its application to actual life problems. Perhaps, the greatest of the ethical principles is the

---

1. अष्टाविंशानि शिवानि शग्मानि सहयोगं भजन्तु मे ।
योगं प्रपद्ये क्षेमं च क्षेमं प्रपद्ये योगं च नमोऽहोरात्राभ्यामस्तु ॥
(Av. 19, 8, 2)

adherence to truth. Truth in speeeh, truth in thought and truth in actions—these are the three aspects of truth. The greatest of the vow is the vow of truth. As will be evident from the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, on every auspicious occassion, when a vow was to be taken, it was the vow of truthfulness. The usual pledge was : "*Anṛtat satyamupaimi*", may I discard falsehood to attain truth. A similar Brāhmanic prayer is : *Asato mā sad gamaya*," from untruth, lead me to truth. The basis of creation is threefold : *Ṛta, Satya and Tapas.* Sometimes it has been said that whatever exists is *sat* or truth and the rest is all non-existing. Sometimes this truth has been allegorically or categorically associated with *sat*, the primordial aspect of *prakṛti* (*prakṛti* has three aspects —*sat*, *rajas and tamas*).

The next to *satya* or truth is *śraddhā.* This word etymologically means the accepting of truth. Acceptance of the truth has another name "faith", but ordinarily this term has been very wrongly used. Having known what truth is, if one submits himself to it, then it is *śraddhā* or real faith. Something whose truthfulness has not been established, if adopted, will not be called *śraddhā.* The following *mantra* of the Yajuḥ[1] is very clear on this point :

Having well seen, *Prajāpati*, the Lord of all, has made the truth and not-truth very distinct. He has placed non-faith in not-truth and faith in truth.
(19,77)

How does a man attain *śraddhā* and *satya*, faith and truth, is also described in the same chapter of

1. दृष्ट्वा रूपे व्याकरोत्सत्यानृते प्रजापतिः । अश्रद्धामनृते ऽदधाच्छ्रद्धाꣳ सत्ये प्रजापतिः ॥ (Yv. 19, 77)

the Yajurveda[1] (19,30).

By the firm determination or vow (*vrata*), one attains right or claim—*dīkṣā.*

By *dīkṣā*, one attains reward or *dakṣiṇā.* It means the respect of others.

By *dakṣiṇā*, one attains *śraddhā* or faith.

By *śraddhā*, one attains *satya* or truth.

The next to truth and *śraddhā* is the attitude of tolerance or *ahimsa.* This implies looking everybody with an eye of frendliness. This friendliness should be extended to all creatures, human and not human both. Friendliness would mean feeling of pain in others just as one feels in himself. In this connection, nothing can be so explicit as the following[2] :

O the kind God, be it so. All creatures may look at me with the eye of a friend.

I may also look at all creatures with the eye of a friend. Let us all see one another with the eye of a friend.

This extends the range of fellow-feeling to all creatures. At another place, it has been said that "*Sarvā āśā mama mitram bhavantu*"—let all the directions be my friend. But such a prayer implies that we should also be friends to all in reciprocity.

Regarding covetousness and rightful possession, an indication is given in the following line : "*Tena tyaktena bhuñjīthā mā gṛdhah kasyasviddhanam*" (Yajuḥ

1. व्रतेन दीक्षामाप्नोति दीक्षयाप्नोति दक्षिणाम् । दक्षिणया श्रद्धामाप्नोति श्रद्धया सत्यमाप्यते ॥ (Yv. 19, 30)
2. दृते दृꣳह मा मित्रस्य मा चक्षुषा सर्वाणि भूतानि समीक्षन्ताम् । मित्रस्याहं चक्षुषा सर्वाणि भूतानि समीक्षे । मित्रस्य चक्षुषा समीक्षामहे ॥ (Yv. 36, 18)

40,1). Whatever has been given by God, by that alone enjoy, and covet not anybody's wealth. Whatever has been given to you, or in other words, whatever you have earned, you have a right to enjoy. Do not be covetous of another's property.

Another interpretation of the line is that "enjoy in this world all unattached. Do not be covetous, for to whom does belong this wealth, *i.e.*, to none."

The unattached living in life is further exhorted in the next *mantra*[1] of the same chapter (Yajuḥ 40,2).

Being always busy in active work, have a desire to live for hundred years. In this way alone and by no other way you can remain unattached to the acttions.

It means that keep always an eye over work, not on its fruit. Be absorbed in work and work alone. This is the only way by which you can remain unattached. But in case you cease working, you will be absorbed in indulgence or *bhoga*, and then the very actions will bind you up.

The unattached life, the life of truthfulness, the life of forbearance and tolerance, the uncoveted life, such a life, in short, is what the Vedic ethics refers to. Unnecessary to say that there is nothing like the life of celibacy. For,

Brahmacaryeṇa devāh mṛtyumupāghnata.

It is the life of celibacy, the life of purity and chastity, by which the godly beings have conquered death. It is *Brahmacharya and Brahmacharya alone* which

1. कुर्वन्नेवेह कर्माणि जिजीविषेच्छतꣳ समाः ।
एवं त्वयि नान्यथेतोऽस्ति न कर्म लिप्यते नरे ॥
(Yv. 40, 2)

leads to immortality. To the word *Brahmacharya* is attached much more significance than to the word celibacy. *Brahmacharya* means the life of chastity in thought, speech and action. It is a godly living. The blessed is one who can lead such a life to perfection.

In all these pages, we have made an attempt to show how Dayānanda has been able to draw up his complete philosophy on the basis of the Vedas alone. In fact, there is nothing new in it, for Upaniṣads as well as the later systems of Indian philosophy also take their stand on the Vedas. But in recent years, there have been so many misgivings regarding the Vedas that their fundmental position is almost ignored. As has been said in the earlier part of the chapter, there has ever been a confusion with regard to the interpretation of the Vedic texts. Our readers may at various places differ with Dayānanda so far as this interprection is concerned. I shall simply remind them that they must know that after Sāyana, Dayānanda was the greatest of the Vedic scholars. The study of the Vedas was a passion of his life. Whatever he has written in this connection, he has written with a sense of responsibility. He cannot be ignored as a scholar. He has tried to contradict a number of notions prevalent regarding this literature. He writes : "All that conforms to the teachings of the Vedas, nature, attributes and characteristics of God is right, the contrary is wrong." He emphatically declares : "We believe that the Vedas alone are the supreme authority in the ascertainment of true religion—the true conduct of life. Whatever is enjoined by the Vedas, we hold to be right ; whilst whatever is condemned by them, we believe to be wrong. Therefore, we say that our religion is Vedic. All men, especially the Āryas should believe in the Vedas and thereby cultivate unity in religion."

THE FUNDAMENTALS OF VEDIC PATH

1. Yama and Niyama—External and internal purification, contentment (which means that one will have to do one's utmost to attain one's object without being carried away by the resulting success or failure), devotion to duty regardless of consequences, austerity, devotion to God, study of the Scriptures and the acquisition of knowledge, fearlessness, determination and passionlessness.

2. Ahimsa—Non-injuring and not giving or causing to be given the least pain, by thought, word or deed, to all living beings at whatever time, for all living beings have the same soul like man.

3. Satya—Truthfulness in thought, word and deed.

4. Asteya—Non-stealing and honesty under all conditions.

5. Brahmacharya—Chastity in thought, word and deed, always and in all conditions.

6. Aparigraha—Non-receiving of any presents from any one, even when one is in great distress. Also abstinence from the headlong pursuit of worldly things and freedom from the pride of one's possessions.

7. Nishkama—Annihilation of all kinds of desire which is the root cause of all bondage.

8. Shama—Restraining one's mind and senses from sin and temptation, and always practising righteousness whether as a man of the world (Path of Pravritti Dharma) or as a man of renunciation (Path of Nivritti Dharma).

9. Dama—Keeping the body and senses aloof from doing evil deeds and in *practising* self-control and living a chaste life.

10. Daya—Kindness to all living beings.

11. Uparati—Never associating oneself with the wicked.

12. Titiksha—Forbearance, being deaf to all worldly applause or censure, and indifferent to profit or loss, joy or sorrow, and throwing oneself heart and soul into the pursuit of the ways and means of emancipation.

13. Shraddha—Having faith in oneself, in God, in the teachings of the Vedas.

14. Samadhana—Peacefulness and concentration of mind.

15. Mumukshutvam—Longing and unflinching love for liberation (Moksha) and perfection (Mukti).

16. Nitya - anitya - vastu - viveka—Discriminating between that which is ephemeral and that which is eternal and permanent.